

REMARKSClaim Changes

Claims 1 and 25 are amended to recite “...determining whether the wireless communication device is disabled...enabling the at least one remote device to become a focal point if the wireless communication device is disabled....” These changes are based on description on page 4 lines 12-13 of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claim 7 is amended to recite “...receiving a command message from the remote mobile device to become a focal point if the remote mobile device is disabled....” These changes are based on description on page 4 lines 12-13 of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claim 29 has been newly added. New claim 29 includes the limitations of independent claim 1. Support for the new claim can be found at least on page 4 lines 12-13. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claim 30 has been newly added. New claim 30 includes the limitations of independent claim 25. Support for the new claim can be found at least on page 4 lines 12-13. Thus, no new matter is added.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Objection to the Claims

In response to the objection to claims 13-16 for informalities, Applicant has renumbered the claims 13 – 16 to claims 25 - 28

Rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,926,103 (Petite)

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Petite as herein amended.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the present application and the cited art and has amended independent claim 1 to clarify the claimed invention. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “...determining whether the wireless communication device is disabled...enabling the at least one remote device to become a focal point if the wireless communication device is disabled....”

Applicant respectfully submits that Petite does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in independent claim 1, as amended. For example, independent claim 1 as amended recites “...determining whether the wireless communication device is disabled...enabling the at least one remote device to become a focal point if the wireless communication device is disabled....” which is not anticipated either expressly or inherently, in Petite. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that the independent claim 1 may now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 3-6 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 3-6 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 5,926,103 (Petite) in view of US 6,876,302 B1 (Steeves)

Dependent claim 2 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claim 2 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 5,926,103 (Petite) in view of US 7,058,409 B1 (Hanninen)

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petite in view of Hanninen as herein amended.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Petite and Hanninen does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 7, as amended. For example, independent claim 7, as amended, recites “...receiving a command message from the remote mobile device to become a focal point if the remote mobile device is disabled....” which are not taught or suggested in the combination of Petite and Hanninen. Since the combination of Petite and Hanninen fails to disclose Applicant’s claimed invention as claimed in the independent claim 7, as amended, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant requests that the independent claim 7 may now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 8-12 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 7. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 8-12 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 5,926,103 (Petite) in view of US 7,070,810 B2 (Petite et al; hereinafter “Petite 810”)

As mentioned above, Applicant respectfully submits that Petite does not disclose “...determining whether the wireless communication device is disabled...enabling the at least one remote device to become a focal point if the wireless communication device is disabled....” Since Petite does not teach or suggest “...determining whether the wireless communication device is disabled...enabling the at least one remote device to become a focal point if the wireless communication device is disabled...”, the combination of Petite with Petite 810 also fails to disclose Applicant’s claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant requests that the independent claim 25 may now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 26-28 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 25. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 26-28 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant’s attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

Please send correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept.
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048
Customer Number: 20280

By: <u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u>	<u>03/13/2008</u>
Hisashi D. Watanabe	Date
Attorney for Applicant	
Registration No. 37,465	
Tel. No. (847) 523-2322	
Fax No. (847) 523-2350	
Email: docketing.libertyville@motorola.com	